Contents

Executive Summary	2
Closure Plan for the ISR Wellfield	3
ISR Wellfield Closure Liability	4
Pullback Pumping	4
Closure Cost Estimation for Bonding	6
Work Plans and Mobilization	6
Labor Costs	6
Pump Replacement Costs	7
Quarterly Reporting	7
Power Costs	8
Wellfield Rinsing Credits	11
Rinsing Verification Sampling	12
Well Abandonment Costs	13
Post-Closure Monitoring	15
Cumulative Closure Liability	16

Tables

- Table R3-1: Closure Costs and Closure Credits by Year
- Table R3-2: Labor Hourly Costs
- Table R3-3: Power Cost for Fresh Water Supply Pumping for Rinsing
- Table R3-4: Power Cost for Rinse Recovery Well Pumping
- Table R3-5: Power Cost for Hydraulic Control Well Pumping
- Table R3-6: Power Cost for Mechanical Evaporation
- Table R3-7: Wellfield Rinsing Credits by Year
- Table R3-8: Worksheet used to Calculate Rinsing Verification Unit Costs
- Table R3-9: Year-By-Year Well Abandonment Cost Summary
- Table R3-10: Cost for Five Years of Post-Closure Monitoring
- Table R3-11: Closure Cost Detail
- Table R3-12: Well Abandonment Cost Detail

UIC Application—Attachment R-3 Gunnison Copper Project Cochise County, Arizona R3-1

Executive Summary

A closure strategy and cost estimate for the Stage 1 Gunnison ISR wellfield has been developed in accordance with ADEQ, ADWR, EPA UIC, and BADCT guidelines. The closure activities will include ISR wellfield rinsing, pullback pumping, rinsing verification monitoring, well abandonment, and post-closure monitoring.

An Aquifer Protection Permit (APP) from ADEQ will be required in addition to the Underground Injection Control (UIC) permit from the EPA. Separate bonds will be held for closure costs associated with the APP and the UIC. The APP bond will consist of pond closure and POC well abandonment costs. The UIC bond will consist of all other costs including rinsing, well abandonment (excluding POCs) pullback pumping, work plans, mobilization, reporting and post closure monitoring.

The closure cost details presented in this attachment are the same as those provided to ADEQ for the APP except for the ponds and the abandonment of the POC wells which have been excluded.

The most extensive closure activity will be the rinsing of the wellfield that will require flushing the leached formations with clean water, the extraction of the impacted rinse water, and evaporating it in the Gunnison Evaporation Pond #1. Costs have been developed for general administration, wellfield labor and maintenance, power for wellfield pumps needed for rinsing, mechanical evaporators, rinsing verification monitoring, and post-closure monitoring.

Well abandonment will be conducted according to ADWR guidelines by removing the wellhead piping and pumps followed by grouting the boreholes in accordance with EPA UIC requirements. Wells scheduled for abandonment include injection and recovery wells, hydraulic control wells, observation wells, intermediate monitor wells (IMWs), rinse verification wells, and Point-of-Compliance (POC) wells. Costs for abandonment were developed using third party contractor costs and include labor and supervision, pre-grouting activities, grouting, perforation (where applicable), casing removal to two feet below the surface, and debris removal.

The costs for ISR wellfield closure by each year are presented in Table R3-1 for the ten years covering Stage 1 production. Credits have also been tabulated for the cost of closure activities that will have been completed by a given year. From the table, the maximum liability (\$8.47 million) occurs in Year 10. The closure costs will be re-evaluated in Year 6. From Table R-1, the difference in cost between Year 10 and Year 6 is approximately \$700,000 that can be used as a contingency for additional pullback pumping if required in Years 1 through 6.

Table R3-1: Summary of Closure Costs and Closure Credits by Year (\$Millions)

Y5	Y6	Y7	Y8	Y9	Y10
3.041	3.159	3.039	3.091	2.962	2.993
2.518	2.878	3.499	3.554	3.556	3.626
2 0.262	0.264	0.262	0.262	0.262	0.262
5 0.902	0.834	0.897	0.865	0.933	0.923
2 0.672	0.714	0.770	0.777	0.771	0.780
2 7.395	7.849	8.467	8.550	8.484	8.585
-0.132	-0.085	-0.164	-0.123	-0.136	-0.120
2 7.263	7.763	8.303	8.427	8.348	8.469
-					
	77.7 N F. V F.	TT A T A T A T A T A T A T A T A T A T			

Closure Plan for the ISR Wellfield

Closure of the ISR wellfield will consist of rinsing and neutralization of the portions of the formation that have been exposed to leach solution. The wells will be closed and abandoned in accordance with UIC regulations and Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR) guidance after rinsing has reduced all constituents to primary MCLs and Arizona Aquifer Water Quality Standards (AWQSs).

Metallurgical test results and geochemical modeling indicate that neutralization and constituent concentration reduction to appropriate levels can be accomplished by a three-step process (as described in Attachment H-2). First, the acidified leaching solution is replaced with clean water to dilute the concentration of leach solution in the formation to approximately 5 percent (Attachment H-3). Second, active circulation of solutions within the subject portion of the wellfield is suspended for approximately 200 days to neutralize the acid. Geochemical modeling based on mineralogy indicates that the leached formation will have sufficient acid neutralizing potential to raise the pH to near neutral. The third step is additional flushing with clean water to reduce regulated constituents to acceptable concentrations. The first rinsing step will require three pore volumes and the second rinse (third step) will require two pore volumes (Attachment H-2). AWQSs and primary MCLs are expected to be met after the rest period (except for a possible minor exceedance of the fluoride AWQS/MCL); the two additional pore volumes are a contingency to provide extra confidence in the expected results.

Clean water for rinsing during Stage 1 production will be provided by water supply wells and unimpacted hydraulic control water. Water for rinsing Stage 2 and Stage 3 wells is anticipated to also include recycled water from a water treatment plant constructed in later stages. For Stage 1, rinse water will directly flow by gravity from the Fresh Water Tank on the Johnson Camp Mine property. In Stages 2 & 3, water for rinsing will be pumped from the Clean Water Pond. In both

cases, water will be injected into the production wellfield. Extracted water during rinsing will be pumped to the Evaporation Pond for disposal by natural and mechanical evaporation. The "first flush", which can be considered the first pore volume, from Step 1 rinsing is expected to contain sufficient copper grade for economical extraction in the SX-EW plant. After the copper concentration drops below the economic threshold, the remainder of rinsate extracted will be sent to the Evaporation Pond.

Rinsing is considered complete when the concentrations of all constituents are at or below AWQSs and primary MCLs. Wells that are accepted as being sufficiently rinsed¹ will be abandoned in accordance with EPA and ADWR criteria. The wells will be grouted from bottom upward using a tremie pipe to eliminate its ability to act as a conduit for solution migration.

1 With the exception of wells that will be used as Rinse Verification and Closure Verification wells. These will be left open for monitoring and abandoned later according to the closure strategy.

ISR Wellfield Closure Liability

When wells are added and put into production, they are assumed to accrue a liability for the complete three step rinsing, as described above. This liability includes all the components of rinsing, verification, and abandonment. This liability continues to grow until rinsing begins. As the rinsing and closure of wells progresses, the liability is reduced in the year that operations are completed in the form of rinsing credits and the removal of wells from the number that need to be abandoned for the subject year. For example, if 183 wells are present at the beginning of the year, 16 are closed (abandoned), and 14 are added, the year-end liability for well abandonment is 181.

The process of rinsing the production wellfield is expected to take approximately two years, since the time duration is dominated by the need to "rest" the wells in order to neutralize the solution. If there are 40 cells (five spot patterns) that need to be rinsed, the first 20 are rinsed for approximately 200 days to achieve three pore volumes of rinsing. The first 20 cells are put into "resting mode" while the second group of 20 cells is rinsed with three pore volumes. The second group is rested while the first group is rinsed with the final two pore volumes for approximately 130 days. After 70 more days of "resting," the second group of wells is rinsed for the final 130 days with an elapsed time of 730 days or 2 years. The volume of cumulative rinsing liability (in gallons) is divided by 576,000 gallons (400 gpm x 60 min x 24 hrs) to approximate the time (in days) for rinsing all of the wells. An additional 10% is added to the time to account for overlaps and inefficiencies in moving from one group of cells to the next.

Costs to complete the wellfield closure and abandonment process have been estimated for each year of Stage 1. Closure of the spent portions of the wellfield is planned to take place throughout the life of the operation beginning in Year 5 when rinsing will begin of the first wells that are anticipated to produce copper concentrations that fall below economic cutoff. These costs are

UIC Application—Attachment R-3 Gunnison Copper Project Cochise County, Arizona R3-4

based on evaluating the annual closure liability for each year of Stage 1 operation if the project were to shut down.

Pullback Pumping

Pullback pumping costs are included in the closure costs to allow for the capture of potential solution excursions from the active mining blocks. The pullback pumping will draw down the water table and "pull back" solutions into the mining area. The pullback pumping will be conducted in conjunction with rinsing of the wellfield.

In the model simulations, particles initially migrate away from mining blocks during operations but then the paths are reversed and particles are captured when recovery or pullback pumping operations begin after a mining year. The modeling shows that all particles are captured within 3 years after pullback pumping starts, with most being captured within one year of pullback pumping. Model simulations were made to evaluate capture in Years 1 and 5 and used to estimate the costs for pullback pumping for all of Stage 1. Excelsior does not believe modeling closure scenarios after year 5 is necessary given that Excelsior will be reviewing the model performance as compared to actual operations as part of the planned review of closure cost bonding after year 6. Modeling at that time will incorporate updates based on operations and monitoring data.

The assumptions used for the pullback pumping simulations are conservative because normal mine operations will create a "sweep" effect outside the perimeter of a mining block specifically to recapture mining solutions as part of the normal recovery operations (i.e. without pullback pumping). Also, no control strategies are simulated, such as local over-pumping to control detected excursions. Pullback pumping will draw in clean water which will naturally rinse the mining area.

It was assumed that after Year 1 and Year 5 of mining, recovery wells around the perimeter of the blocks would be operated to pull back any potential solutions as represented by particles in the model. For the Year 5 scenario, the two hydraulic control (HC) wells along the southern boundary of the wellfield also need to be operated.

Costs for the pullback pumping have been estimated for each year of Stage 1. The additional labor and power costs for pullback pumping have been included with the closure costs.

Closure Cost Estimation for Bonding

The following sections provide details on the various cost categories shown in **Table R3-11**.

Work Plans and Mobilization

In the event that the operators of the project default on their obligations under the permit, it is assumed that the EPA and/or the State of Arizona would have the responsibility of completing closure and post-closure operations. The State would likely hire a remediation contractor to conduct the necessary closure and post-closure operations, using subcontractors where necessary to perform such services as rinsing, well abandonment, and pump replacement. It is also assumed that the contractor would have to prepare work plans, assemble a team and mobilize to the site to begin rinsing and closure operations. A lump sum estimate of \$75,000 has been allocated for the preparation of work plans. An additional \$20,000 has been allocated for mobilization and demobilization from the site.

Labor Costs

The process of rinsing the production wellfield and the pullback pumping is estimated to take three years. The rinsing is rested for a year to naturally neutralize the solution and the pullback pumping occurs throughout the three years. Therefore, three years of wellfield operation, maintenance, and general and administrative costs are included in the closure costs regardless of the mining year in Stage 1 that the mining operations cease.

The operation of the wellfield can be managed by a supervisor, two operators, an electrician and site security personnel during the rinsing and pullback pumping cycle. Hourly rates for wellfield rinsing staff are shown in Table R3-2 and unit costs are shown in Table R3-11 on Lines 58-62.

Table R3-2: Labor Hourly Costs

Position	Quantity	Hourly Rate
Project Manager	1	\$125
Rinsing Supervisor	1	\$72
Wellfield Operator	2	\$56
Wellfield Electrician	1	\$44
Site Security	1	\$30
Overhead	10%	

UIC Application—Attachment R-3 Gunnison Copper Project Cochise County, Arizona R3-6

Hourly rates were obtained by using R.S. Means conversions of local, published salaries for specific positions. Labor costs were developed by taking the rinsing duration in days and dividing them by 7 to determine number of weeks. The project manager was assigned 10 hours per week while the field personnel were assigned 40 hours per week and site security 60 hours per week. An overhead charge of 10% was applied to all labor rates to cover such things as vehicle use and administrative and field expenses.

Pump Replacement Costs

Before rinsing can begin, submersible pumps in the recovery wells need to be changed for similar pumps with a smaller discharge rate. Rinsing operations are limited by the supply of fresh water available at the Johnson Camp Mine (approximately 400 gpm), so it is impractical to rinse the wellfield at production-level injection rates. A subcontractor with well maintenance experience will be used to change the pumps.

During production, the recovery wells will typically be sized to pump approximately 80 gpm. During rinsing, the recovery pumping rates for rinsate will be typically 25% of that rate, or 20 gpm, requiring a change in the pumps to operate efficiently. Costs for pump replacement and well maintenance have been estimated on a contract basis using a quote from Verdad, Inc. in Tucson. The cost for a replacement pump for 20 gpm recovery is estimated at \$2,990. Labor, rig costs, and per diem are estimated at 4 hours per well for rig and labor costs, and ½ day of per diem per well. A single mobilization charge of \$1,500 is estimated for pump replacement. It was assumed that a new submersible well pump would be capable of recovering rinsate for the estimated 330 days of pumping required without significant maintenance costs.

Quarterly Reporting

As mentioned above, in the event that the operators of the project default on their obligations under the permit, it is assumed that the EPA and/or the State of Arizona would have the responsibility of completing closure and post-closure operations for purposes of calculating the closure bond. The remediation contractor will prepare quarterly reports. In any given year, the number of reports that it will take to complete rinsing will vary, depending on how many cells must be rinsed. For example, in Year 4, the duration of rinsing needed for existing wells is 676 days (Line 5 of Table R3-1) so there will be 8 quarterly reports prepared (Line 22).

Power Costs

The primary cost of rinsing is power. Power costs are based on the cost of power (\$0.08/kWh) from Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Co-operative to the Johnson Camp Mine during recent operation before the mine went into care and maintenance. Unit power costs (\$/Mgal) are discussed below for the following:

- Water Supply Pumping for Rinsing
- Rinse Recovery Pumping
- Hydraulic control Pumping
- Mechanical Evaporation

Water supply costs for rinsing are based on the existing wells at the Johnson Camp Mine and the estimated power cost to pump 400 gallons per minute (gpm) divided by the flow rate requirement to accomplish the rinsing. Water supply is provided by two 60 hp pumps capable of producing 400 gpm. The cost per gallon of water supply for rinsing is \$0.0002685, or \$268.45 per million gallons (/Mgal) as shown in Table R3-3.

Table R3-3: Power Cost for Fresh Water Supply Pumping for Rinsing

Description	Units	Quantity
Water Supply output	gpm	400
Conversion	gph	24,000
Water Supply Pump motors	hp	120
Conversion	kW/hp	0.746
Power Factor	%	90
Power usage	kW	80.5
Cost per kW-hr	\$	0.080
Pumping Cost per hour	\$	6.44
Water Supply Power Cost	\$/gal	0.0002685
Water Supply Power Cost	\$/Mgal	\$268.45

Rinsate from the recovery wells is pumped up to the Gunnison Evaporation Pond. Maintenance for these pumps is included in wellfield maintenance. The rinse recovery pumping liability assumes a 5 hp motor capable of pumping 15 gpm per well against a total dynamic head of over 600 feet with a power cost of \$0.08 per kilowatt-hour (kW-hr) to extract rinse water. The cost per gallon of rinse recovery pumping is \$0.0002983, or \$298.28/Mgal as shown in Table R3-4.

Table R3-4: Power Cost for Rinse Recovery Well Pumping

Description	Units	Quantity
Rinse Recovery Pumping	gpm	15
Conversion	gph	900
Recovery Pump motors	hp	5
Conversion	kW/hp	0.746
Power Factor	%	90
Power usage	kW	3.4
Cost per kW-hr	\$	0.080
Pumping Cost per hour	\$	0.27
Rinse Recovery Pumping Cost	\$/gal	0.0002983
Rinse Recovery Pumping Cost	\$/Mgal	\$298.28

Hydraulic control wells are outfitted with 5 HP pumps. These pumps must be utilized throughout the rinsing process to ensure that hydraulic control is maintained to prevent excursions of impacted rinse solutions until the formations are adequately rinsed. Table R3-5 summarizes the power consumption and cost of power for hydraulic control wells during closure.

Table R3-5: Power Cost for Hydraulic Control Well Pumping

Description	Units	Quantity
Hydraulic Control Pumping	gpm	15
Conversion	gph	900
Recovery Pump motors	hp	5
Conversion	kW/hp	0.746
Power Factor	%	90
Power usage	kW	3.4
Cost per kW-hr	\$	0.080
Pumping Cost per hour	\$	0.27
Hydraulic Control Pumping Cost	\$/gal	0.0002983
Hydraulic Control Pumping Cost	\$/Mgal	\$298.28

Power costs for mechanical evaporation of the rinsate are based on vendor information using climatic data for the Johnson Camp mine. The annual average evaporation required is 37.6 million gallons. The evaporator model that has been selected for purposes of this estimate is the Mega Polecat model from SMI Evaporative Systems. One operating evaporator and one standby evaporator are needed in Years 1 and 2. The number of evaporators reaches a maximum seven operating and one standby in Year 7. However, in full-scale rinsing during closure the available rinse water flow heading to evaporation will be 440 gpm, requiring 11 evaporators total. The capital cost for adding 9 evaporators (11 total) at \$91,000 per evaporator (with controls, based on a quote from SMI Evaporative Solutions) is held constant throughout the closure cost estimate to provide for the additional units required during closure.

The capacity of one evaporator is 130 gpm with an average evaporation efficiency calculated from manufacturer's data of 55% for an evaporation rate of 71.5 gpm, or 4,290 gallons per hour. The fan motor and pump to supply water to the unit total 90 hp. The unit rate for evaporation is \$0.001129 per gallon, or \$1,126.83 per million gallons as shown in Table R3-6.

Table R3-6: Power Cost for Mechanical Evaporation

Description	Units	Quantity
Evaporation Rate	gpm	71.5
Conversion	gph	4,290
Fan Pump	hp	60
Feed Pump	hp	30
Conversion	kW/hp	0.746
Power Factor	%	90
Power usage (fan+pump)	kW	60.4
Cost per kW-hr	\$	0.080
Evaporator Power Cost per hour	\$/hr	4.83
Evaporation Power Cost	\$/gal	0.0011268
Evaporation Power Cost	\$/Mgal	\$1,126.83

Wellfield Rinsing Credits

The process of closing production wells is scheduled to begin in Year 5 of production. The first step in well closure is early rinsing in which the leach solution is replaced with clean water to dilute the pore water in the formation approximately 95 percent. Geochemical studies (Attachment H-2) indicate that this will require injection of approximately three pore volumes of clean water. Once complete, the closure liability is reduced by the cost of that rinsing and is shown as a credit (Line 103 of Table R3-11 and Table R3-7). The early rinsing credit is calculated as three-fifths of the rinsing liability, since it takes three of the five pore volumes necessary to complete the rinsing.

The second step of rinsing involves shutting down the wellfield for approximately 200 days. Rinse water injection and rinsate recovery is stopped to allow the remaining solution to be neutralized by the formation. The natural acid neutralizing potential of the formation has been shown by metallurgical test work to bring the rinse water resting in the formation to near neutral pH in approximately 200 days. After the rest phase, the geochemical model indicates that only fluoride will exceed the AWQS/primary MCL.

Additional rinsing is conducted in step three to flush out constituents remaining in the formation after neutralization. Geochemical modeling indicates that an additional two pore volumes of rinse water needs to be injected and recovered to reduce all constituents (specifically fluoride—all others are expected to meet AWQSs and primary MCLs at the end of the rest phase) to AWQSs/MCLs. In the rinsing schedule this 200 days is approximated by one year. The rinsing credit for this late rinsing is the remaining two-fifths of the water supply, rinsate extraction pumping, rinsate pumping, and evaporation liability.

Table R3-7: Wellfield Rinsing Credits by Year

Category	Rate	Unit	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y6	Y7	Y8	Y9	Y10
Early Rinse cells		5-Spot		İ			14	9	8	7	9	8
Pore volume@3% porosity per cell	1.863	Mgal					26.077	16.764	14.901	13.039	16.764	14.901
Early Rinse volume	3 pore volumes	Mgal			Samurananan		78.231	50.292	44.704	39.116	50.292	44.704
WaterSupply Power Credits	\$268	\$Mgal		Constitution of the Consti	and on the last		\$21,001	\$13,501	\$12,001	\$10,501	\$13,501	\$12,001
RinseRecovery PumpingPower Credits	\$298	\$Mgal					\$23,335	\$15,001	\$13,334	\$11,667	\$15,001	\$13,334
Early RinsatePumpingCredits	\$0	\$Mgal					\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
EvaporationPower Credits	\$1,127	\$Mgal					\$88,153	\$56,670	\$50,373	\$44,076	\$56,670	\$50,373
	Yearly Early	Rinse Credits		Col Mercino	2		\$132,489	\$85,172	\$75,708	\$66,245	\$85,172	\$75,708
LateRinseBlocks	anna de	block			Words do (1)			in the free free free free free free free fr	14	9	8	7
Pore volume@3% porosity per cell	1.863	Mgal							26.077	16.764	14.901	13.039
LateRinse volume	2 pore volumes	Mgal							52.154	33.528	29.802	26.077
WaterSupply Power Credits	\$268	\$Mgal						-	\$14,001	\$9,001	\$8,001	\$7,000
RinseRecovery PumpingPower Credits	\$298	\$/Mgal						- Carlonness	\$15,557	\$10,001	\$8,889	\$7,778
LateRinsatePumpingCredits	\$0	\$Mgal							\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Evaporation Power Credits	\$1,127	\$/Mgal						1	\$58,769	\$37,780	\$33,582	\$29,384
	Yearly Late	Rinse Credits		-	-		\$0	\$0	\$88,326	\$56,781	\$50,472	\$44,163
Tota	Yearly Wellfield Ri	insing Credits					\$132,489	\$85,172	\$164,034	\$123,026	\$135,644	\$119,871

UIC Application—Attachment R-3 Gunnison Copper Project Cochise County, Arizona R3-11

Rinsing Verification Sampling

Rinsing verification consists of groundwater monitoring of injection/recovery wells after rinsing is completed. The cost was calculated for each year of Stage 1 (Years 1-10) based on the number of injection and recovery wells in existence during that year (Table R3-8). The following assumptions were made:

- Labor costs are based on Clear Creek Associates' Staff 1 billing rate, which is the appropriate staffing level for this task.
- After rinsing of Block 1, 100% of extraction wells (24 wells) will be sampled for rinse verification. For subsequent blocks, 10% of extraction wells will be monitored for rinse verification, if it can be shown that 10% is representative of the overall groundwater quality within the block (based on the Block 1 results).
- Current pricing from Turner Laboratories in Tucson, AZ was used to calculate analytical laboratory costs.
- No purging is required as the wells will be sampled at the end of rinsing steps so they will already be purged.
- Assumed 1.5 hours of collection time per sample.

Sampling of 10% of the recovery wells is justifiable based on the spacing and number of wells. The entire wellfield is approximately 192 acres. During the life of the project there will be approximately 1,400 injection/recovery wells operating within the wellfield. Sampling 10% of the wells equates to one well for every 0.73 acres. The dimensions of a 1.4-acre square block are less than 250 feet by 250 feet. Excelsior considers this to be a high sample density that will adequately characterize the effectiveness of rinsing. A sample size of 10% is typically considered statistically significant for quality assurance (QA) verification by ADEQ and other governmental agencies.

Table R3-8: Worksheet used to Calculate Rinsing Verification Unit Costs

					YEAR														
				Y1		Y2		Y3	Y4	١,	′5	Y6		Y	7	Y8	`	9	Y10
Description	Qty	Rate	Unit	24		4		5	6		6	-	6	_	6	6		6	6
Sample collection (1 hours per sampleno purging required)	1.5	\$95.00	hr	\$ 3,420	\$	570	\$	713	\$ 855	\$	855	\$	855	\$	855	\$ 855	\$	855	\$ 855
Field ParametersMeter(ClearCreek Rate)	2	\$25.00	day	\$ 50	\$	50	\$	50	\$ 50	\$	50	\$	50	\$	50	\$ 50	\$	50	\$ 50
Misc.field costsper well (2)	1	\$25.00	each	\$ 600	\$	100	\$	125	\$ 150	\$	150	\$	150	\$	150	\$ 150	\$	150	\$ 150
Mileage (from Tucson) based on 2 trips per year	280	\$0.55	each	\$ 154	\$	154	\$	154	\$ 154	\$	154	\$	154	\$	154	\$ 154	\$	154	\$ 154
Field Truck(ClearCreek Rate)	2	\$95.00	daily	\$ 190	\$	190	\$	190	\$ 190	\$	190	\$	190	\$	190	\$ 190	\$	190	\$ 190
Generator Rental (trailer mounted, from Sunstate Rentals)(3)	1	\$713.00	week	\$ 713	\$	713	\$	713	\$ 713	\$	713	\$	713	\$	713	\$ 713	\$	713	\$ 713
Laboratory Costs (TURNER)(1)																			
Dissolved Metals ICP (Sb, As, Ba, Be, Cd, Cr, Pb, Se, Th, Ni)	1	\$80.00	sample	\$ 1,920	\$	320	\$	400	\$ 480	\$	480	\$	480	\$	480	\$ 480	\$	480	\$ 480
Mercury dissolved	1	\$41.00	sample	\$ 984	\$	164	\$	205	\$ 246	\$	246	\$	246	\$	246	\$ 246	\$	246	\$ 246
Fluoride	1	\$20.00	sample	\$ 480	\$	80	\$	100	\$ 120	\$	120	\$	120	\$	120	\$ 120	\$	120	\$ 120
VOCs	1	\$150.00	sample	\$ 3,600	\$	600	\$	750	\$ 900	\$	900	\$	900	\$	900	\$ 900	\$	900	\$ 900
TDS	1	\$21.00	sample	\$ 504	\$	84	\$	105	\$ 126	\$	126	\$	126	\$	126	\$ 126	\$	126	\$ 126
pHfield	1	\$0.00	sample	\$ -	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	\$	ı	\$,	\$	-	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -
nitrate+nitrite	1	\$30.00	sample	\$ 720	\$	120	\$	150	\$ 180	\$	180	\$	180	\$	180	\$ 180	\$	180	\$ 180
dissolved U	1	\$150.00	sample	\$ 3,600	\$	600	\$	750	\$ 900	\$	900	\$	900	\$	900	\$ 900	\$	900	\$ 900
Ra226 + Ra 228	1	\$195.00	sample	\$ 4,680	\$	780	\$	975	\$ 1,170	\$ 1	,170	\$ 1,	,170	\$ 1,	,170	\$ 1,170	\$ 1	,170	\$ 1,170
gross alpha	1	\$85.00	sample	\$ 2,040	\$	340	\$	425	\$ 510	\$	510	\$	510	\$	510	\$ 510	\$	510	\$ 510
Data Management, Reporting per sample	2	\$95.00	hr	\$ 4,560	\$	760	\$	950	\$ 1,140	\$ 1	,140	\$ 1,	,140	\$ 1,	,140	\$ 1,140	\$ 1	,140	\$ 1,140
Annual Cost				\$ 28,215	\$	5,625	\$ 6	5,755	\$ 7,884	\$ 7	,884	\$ 7,	,884	\$ 7,	,884	\$ 7,884	\$ 7	,884	\$ 7,884
Unit Cost per Sample				\$ 1,176	\$	1,406	\$ 1	1,351	\$ 1,314	\$ 1	,314	\$ 1,	,314	\$ 1,	,314	\$ 1,314	\$ 1	,314	\$ 1,314
Notes: (1) Unit Costs from Turner Laboratories in Tucson, AZ (2) ice, disposables, fuel for generator. (3) weekly unit rate is marked up by 15%, Rate from SunState														hicking.					

The annual costs were divided by the number of samples per year to arrive at a unit cost (Table R3-8). The highest unit cost is in Year 1 (\$1,406 per sample in Year 2). This unit cost was used each year to calculate the closure costs for each year.

Well Abandonment Costs

Clear Creek obtained unit costs from three licensed drilling companies in Arizona to compile well abandonment costs. Unit costs (i.e. cost per well to abandon) were calculated for the different types of wells: injection/recovery, hydraulic control, point of compliance, observation, and Intermediate Monitor wells (IMWs). Unit costs for abandonment of each well type are based on the well depth and diameter (volume of grout needed), and whether or not perforation will be required. Injection and recovery wells and hydraulic control wells will be open hole completion so the abandonment costs are relatively low because perforation is not necessary. Observation wells, point of compliance wells and the IMWs with screen and annular materials will be more expensive to abandon because they will require perforation. The average depth of wells in this portion of the mineralization is expected to be approximately 1,435 feet below land surface, so a depth of 1450 feet was used to calculate the well abandonment costs using third party unit costs provided by Yellow Jacket Drilling, a licensed well driller in Arizona.

Table R3-9 below provides a summary of year-by-year abandonment costs for all wells in existence during each year of Stage 1 operations. Table R3-10 (provided at the end of this text) provides detailed post closure monitoring costs.

Table R3-9: Year-By-Year Well Abandonment Cost Summary

	W	ellfield	Н	c w	ells	Obs	s W	/ells	II∨	1Ws	R\	√Ws	
Year	Quantity	Cost	Quantity		Cost	Quantity		Cost	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	TOTAL
Y1	38	\$ 648,660	3	\$	30,900	2	\$	83,240	31	\$ 328,600	0	\$ -	\$ 1,091,400
Y2	58	\$ 970,660	5	\$	51,500	4	\$	166,480	29	\$ 307,400	0	\$ -	\$ 1,496,040
Y3	78	\$ 1,249,760	5	\$	51,500	4	\$	166,480	27	\$ 286,200	0	\$ -	\$ 1,753,940
Y4	95	\$ 1,562,600	6	\$	61,800	6	\$	249,720	26	\$ 275,600	0	\$ -	\$ 2,149,720
Y5	116	\$ 1,899,920	9	\$	92,700	6	\$	249,720	26	\$ 275,600	0	\$ -	\$ 2,517,940
Y6	132	\$ 2,156,240	11	\$	113,300	8	\$	332,960	26	\$ 275,600	0	\$ -	\$ 2,878,100
Y7	150	\$ 2,445,200	19	\$	195,700	14	\$	582,680	26	\$ 275,600	0	\$ -	\$ 3,499,180
Y8	150	\$ 2,442,200	19	\$	195,700	14	\$	582,680	25	\$ 265,000	4	\$ 68,000	\$ 3,553,580
Y9	148	\$ 2,410,160	19	\$	195,700	14	\$	582,680	25	\$ 265,000	6	\$102,000	\$ 3,555,540
Y10	152	\$ 2,468,240	19	\$	195,700	14	\$	582,680	23	\$ 243,800	8	\$136,000	\$ 3,626,420

Abandonment costs are provided for wells, including injection/recovery wells, observation wells, hydraulic control wells, and the IMWs. The POC wells will be installed for the purposes of the APP and the bonding for abandonment will be held by ADEQ.

Assumptions used in calculating abandonment costs are provided at the bottom of the spreadsheet and are linked to the appropriate line items. Some of the key assumptions are:

- 1. Average total depth of wells is 1450 feet.
- 2. Average of 1150 feet of grout will be used to abandon each well to meet ADWR/UIC requirements for the grouted interval.
- 3. Injection/recovery wells will be open hole completion with a 7-inch diameter borehole.
- 4. Hydraulic control wells will be open hole completion with a 5-inch diameter borehole.
- 5. Observation and some of the IMW wells will be constructed with screen and annular materials. Perforation costs are included for these wells.
- 6. One mobilization is included for all wells (excluding the POC wells)
- 7. Consultant labor rates are based on Clear Creek Associates' billing rates, which are consistent with the industry standard in Arizona.

The highest year for well abandonment in Stage 1 is Year 10, with a total cost of approximately 3.63 million.

Post-Closure Monitoring

The post-closure monitoring will comprise 5 years of annual monitoring at three POC wells and within the wellfield at Closure Verification Wells (CVWs). The wellfield will be considered closed when five consecutive annual rounds of monitoring at the CVWs and the POCs meet AWQSs and MCLs. While this monitoring is scheduled to take place over 5 years at the end of mining, the total cost is included for Years 1 to 10 in the event of premature cessation of operations. Costs for 5 years of post-closure monitoring are estimated to be \$154,230 as shown in Table R3-10:

Table R3-10: Cost for Five Years of Post-Closure Monitoring

Sample collection (8 hours per sample, 15 samples) 440 \$95.00 hr 0 \$41,800.00 Field Parameters/Meter 55 \$25.00 day \$1,375.00 Misc. field costs5 events 5 \$300.00 lumpsum \$1,500.00 Mileage (from Tucson) (15 days at 140 miles per day) 770 \$0.55 mile \$423.50 Field Truck 55 \$95.00 daily \$5,225.00 Generator Rental (trailer mounted, from Sunstate Rentals) 10 \$713.00 week 15 \$8,199.50 LaboratoryCosts 5 \$80.00 sample 15 \$5,980.00 Mercury dissolved 65 \$41.00 sample 15 \$3,064.75 Fluoride 65 \$20.00 sample 15 \$1,495.00 VOCs 65 \$150.00 sample 15 \$1,212.50 TDS 65 \$21.00 sample 15 \$1,212.50 PH-field 65 \$20.00 sample 15 \$0.00	(2)(3) (5) (8) (7) (1)(4) (1)(4) (1)(4) (1)(4)
Misc. field costs—5 events 5 \$300.00 lumpsum \$1,500.00 Mileage (from Tucson) (15 days at 140 miles per day) 770 \$0.55 mile \$423.50 Field Truck 55 \$95.00 daily \$5,225.00 Generator Rental (trailer mounted, from Sunstate Rentals) 10 \$713.00 week 15 \$8,199.50 Laboratory Costs 5 \$80.00 sample 15 \$5,980.00 Mercury dissolved 65 \$41.00 sample 15 \$3,064.75 Fluoride 65 \$2000 sample 15 \$1,495.00 VOCs 65 \$15000 sample 15 \$11,212.50 TDS 65 \$21.00 sample 15 \$1,227.50	(8) (7) (1)(4) (1)(4) (1)(4)
Mileage (from Tucson) (15 days at 140 miles per day) 770 \$0.55 mile \$423.50 Field Truck 55 \$95.00 daily \$5,225.00 Generator Rental (trailer mounted, from Sunstate Rentals) 10 \$713.00 week 15 \$8,199.50 LaboratoryCosts 5 \$80.00 sample 15 \$5,980.00 Dissolved MetalsICP (Sb, As, Ba, Be, Cd, Cr, Pb, Se, Th, Ni) 65 \$80.00 sample 15 \$5,980.00 Mercury dissolved 65 \$41.00 sample 15 \$3,064.75 Fluoride 65 \$20.00 sample 15 \$1,495.00 VOCs 65 \$150.00 sample 15 \$1,121.50 TDS 65 \$21.00 sample 15 \$1,269.75	(8) (7) (1)(4) (1)(4) (1)(4)
Field Truck 55 \$95.00 daily \$5,225.00 Generator Rental (trailer mounted, from Sunstate Rentals) 10 \$713.00 week 15 \$8,199.50 LaboratoryCosts 	(7) (1)(4) (1)(4) (1)(4)
September Sept	(1)(4) (1)(4) (1)(4)
LaboratoryCosts Second Sample 15 \$5,980.00 Dissolved Metals ICP (Sb, As, Ba, Be, Cd, Cr, Pb, Se, Th, Ni) 65 \$80.00 sample 15 \$5,980.00 Mercury dissolved 65 \$41.00 sample 15 \$3,064.75 Fluoride 65 \$20.00 sample 15 \$1,495.00 VOCs 65 \$150.00 sample 15 \$11,212.50 TDS 65 \$21.00 sample 15 \$1,569.75	(1)(4) (1)(4) (1)(4)
Dissolved MetalsICP (Sb, As, Ba, Be, Cd, Cr, Pb, Se, Th, Ni) 65 \$80.00 sample 15 \$5,980.00	(1)(4) (1)(4)
Mercury dissolved 65 \$41.00 sample 15 \$3,064.75 Fluoride 65 \$20.00 sample 15 \$1,495.00 VOCs 65 \$150.00 sample 15 \$11,212.50 TDS 65 \$21.00 sample 15 \$1,569.75	(1)(4) (1)(4)
Fluoride 65 \$20.00 sample 15 \$1,495.00 VOCs 65 \$150.00 sample 15 \$11,212.50 TDS 65 \$21.00 sample 15 \$1,569.75	(1)(4)
VOCs 65 \$15.000 sample 15 \$11,212.50 TDS 65 \$21.00 sample 15 \$1,569.75	
TDS 65 \$21.00 sample 15 \$1,569.75	(1)(4)
pHfield 65 \$0.00 sample 0 \$0.00	(1)(4)
	(1)(4)
nitrate+nitrite 65 \$30.00 sample 15 \$2,242.50	(1)(4)
dissolved U 65 \$150.00 sample 15 \$11,212.50	(1)(4)
Ra226+Ra 228 65 \$195.00 sample 15 \$14,576.25	(1)(4)
gross alpha 65 \$85.00 sample 15 \$6,353.75	(1)(4)
Data Management, Reporting 400 \$95.00 hr \$38,000.00	
POC well plugging and abandonment	(6)
Oversight for well plugging and abandonment (5 POC wells)	(6)
Post-ClosureCosts Total \$154,230.00	
NOTES: Yearly average \$30,846.00	
This is for 5 years post closure monitoring starting at end of Stage 1 (Year 10)	
Assumptions	
(1)Totalof 65 samples will be collected. ((3 POC wells + 8 Closure Verification Wells) x (5 annuale vents) + (10 Duplicates)) = 65 samples	
(2) 55 samples x 8 hours/sample = 440 hours	
(3) Duplicates not included in sampling time.	
(4) Unit Costs from Turner Laboratories in Tucson, AZ	
(5) Ice, disposables, fuel for generator.	
(6) Included in well abandonment spreadsheet	

(7) weekly unit rate is marked up by 15%. Rate from SunState

Cumulative Closure Liability

The final row in Table R3-1 shows the cumulative wellfield liability with deductions for closure expenses projected to have been accrued to that point on a year-by-year basis. The closure liability for Stage 1 production peaks in Year 10 at \$8.47 million. Without taking credit for scheduled closure items, the maximum closure liability is \$8.59 million, also occurring in Year 10. These closure costs are the same as those provided to the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) for the Aquifer Protection Permit (APP) except that the APP closure costs also include closure costs for impoundments and POC wells.

References

M3 Engineering & Technology Corp., 2014. Gunnison Copper Project, N143-1 01 Technical Report, Prefeasibility Study, Cochise County, Arizona, USA. February 14, 2014.

December 2016 Attachment R-3 by M-3 Engineering

March, May and July 2017 Revisions by Axelrod, Inc.

EXPIRES 9/30/18

				LOSURE COS	T DETAIL							
NE C	osure Costs	Unit	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y6	Y7	Y8	Y9	Y10
2	Mining Block Area	ft ²	140,000	90,000	80,000	70,000	90,000	80,000	80,000	90,000	60,000	80,000
3	Rinsing Valume (5 pare valumes)	Mgal	130.4	83.8	74.5	65.2	83.8	74.5	74.5	83.8	55.9	74.5
4	Cumulative Rinsing Volume	Mgali	130.4	214.2	288.7	353.9	359.5	383.7	361.4	372.5	348.3	352.0
5	Duration of Rinsing @ 400 gpm	days	249	409	551	676	687	733	690	711	665	672
6	Pullback Pumping Volume	Mgal	513	448	384	319	255	255	255	255	255	255
7							Quant	tities				
8	Prepare Work Plans	lump sum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
9	Mobilization	lump sum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
10	Labor											
11	Project Manager	hour	356	584	788	966	981	1,047	986	1,016	950	960
12	Wellfield Supervisor	hour	1,423	2,338	3,151	3,862	3,923	4,187	3,943	4,065	3,801	3,842
13	Wellfield Operators (2)	hour	2,846	4,675	6,301	7,724	7,846	8,375	7,887	8,131	7,602	7,683
14	Wellfield Electrician	hour	1,423	2,338	3,151	3,862	3,923	4,187	3,943	4,065	3,801	3,842
15	Site Security	hour	2,134	3,506	4,726	5,793	5,885	6,281	5,915	6,098	5,702	5,763
16 17	Changing Pumps											
18	RecoveryWells		24	35	47	57	56	53	53	51	51	54
19	Mobilization	lumpsum	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
20	Service Rig and Crew (2)	hour	96	140	188	228	224	212	212	204	204	216
21	Per diem	day	12	17.5	23.5	28.5	28	26.5	26.5	25.5	25.5	27
22	(a dia ii	uay	12	11.0	20.0	20.0	20	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	21
23 24	Quarterly Reporting	quarter	3	5	7	8	8	9	8	8	8	8
25	Volumes for Power Costs											
26	Water Supply	Mgal	130	214	289	354	359	384	361	373	348	352
27	Rinse Recovery Pumping	Mgal	130	214	289	354	359	384	361	373	348	352
28	Early Rinsate Pumping	Mgal	78	129	173	212	216	230	217	224	209	211
29	Late Rinsate Pumping	Mgal	52	86	115	142	144	153	145	149	139	141
30	Pullback Pumping	Mgal	513	448	384	319	255	255	255	255	255	255
31	Evaporation Volume Rinsate	Mgal	130	214	289	354	359	384	361	373	348	352
32	Evaporation Volume Pullback	Mgal	513	448	384	319	255	255	255	255	255	255
33	Hydraulic Control Pumping (4 yrs)	Mgal	50	56	61	67	73	73	73	73	73	73
34			ì		i							
35 36	Rinsing Verification Sampling	sample	24	4	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	- 6
37	Pond Closure											
38	Evaporation Pond Closure	each	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
39	Evaporation Pond Post Closure	each	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
40	Pipeline Drain Pond Closure	each	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	•
41	Pipeline Drain Pond Post Closure	each	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
42	Well Abandonment											
44	Welfield	each	38	58	78	95	116	132	150	150	148	152
45	HC wells	each	3	5	5		9	11	19	19	19	19
46	Observation wells	each	2	4	4	- 6	6	8	14	14	14	14
47	POC wells	each	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
48	IMW	each	31	29	27	26	26	26	26	25	25	23
49	Rinse Verification wells	each	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	
50	1 ti 20 vonikuda i wono	CONT	•	9	v		·	· ·	<u> </u>	7	Ů	
51	Post Closure Monitoring (3 POCs, 8 RWVs, 5 years)	Sample rounds	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
52	1											

Page 1 of 2

NE C	losure Costs	Unit	<u>Y1</u>	CLOSURE CO	Y3	Y4	Y5	V/c	Y7	V0		140
54		Onk		12	13	14		Y6	Y/	Y8	Y9	Y10
55	Prepare Work Plans	\$75,000	675 000	075 000	075 000	275 ppg	Estimat				_	
56	Mobilization		\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,00
57	Labor	\$20,000	\$20,000	520,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,00
58	Project Manager	P40E	644.454	C70 040	500 157	6400 000	a 100 F0 1					
59	Wellfield Supervisor	\$125 \$72	\$44,464 \$102,446	S73,048	\$98,457	\$120,689	\$122,594	\$130,852	\$123,230	\$127,041	\$118,783	
60	Wellfield Operators (2)	\$72 \$56		\$168,304	5226,844	\$278,067	\$282,457	5301,483	\$283,921	\$292,702	\$273,676	
61	Wellfield Electrician	336	\$159,360	\$261,806	\$352,869	\$432,549	\$439,378	\$468,974	\$441,655	\$455,314	\$425,719	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
62	Site Security	\$44 \$30	\$62,606 \$64,029	\$102,852 \$105,190	\$138,627 \$141,778	\$169,930	\$172,613	\$184,240	\$173,507	\$178,873	\$167,247	\$169,03
63	Overhead, Vehicles, & Expenses	10%	\$43,290	\$71,120	\$95,857	\$173,792 \$117,503	\$176,536 \$119,358	S188,427	\$177,451	\$182,939	\$171,048	
64	Labor for pullback pumping	\$	\$1,235,039	Street Contract Contr	\$53,637 \$793,641	\$611,889		\$127,398	\$119,976	\$123,687	\$115,647	\$116,88
35		Ψ	Ψ1,200,000	\$1,001,000	3/33,041	Φ011,009;	S596,310	\$528,802	\$591,117	\$559,959	\$627,467	\$617,08
66	Changing Pumps						nacida e sencición de senciones e en escala e en escala e en en escala e en e	Teller Joseph and Branch and Joseph		Outrous voluments	Wilderstand Commenter of the	inno to a tomor auco
67	Capital Cost for pump replacements	\$2,990	\$71,760	\$104,650	\$140,530	\$170,430	\$167,440	\$158,470	\$158,470	\$152,490	\$152,490	\$161,46
68	Mobilization	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000
69	Service Rig and Crew (2)	\$180	\$17,280	\$25,200	\$33,840	\$41,040	\$40,320	\$38,160	\$38,160	\$36,720	\$36,720	\$38,88
70	Perdiem	\$350	\$4,200	\$6,125	\$8,225	\$9,975	\$9,800	\$9,275	\$9,275	\$8,925	\$8,925	\$9,45
72							V		The second secon			
73	Quarterly Reporting	\$1,620	\$4,860	\$8,100	\$11,340	\$12,960	\$12,960	\$14,580	\$12,960	\$12,960	\$12,960	\$12,960
74 75	Rinsing, Pullback, Capital & Power Costs	AND CONTRACTOR			CONTRACTOR AND STREET	reneralism and access		~			Marie Communication	Janes Comment (2.00)
76	Mechanical Evaporator Capital (9 units)	91,000	\$819,000	\$819,000	\$819.000	\$819,000	\$819,000	\$819.000	\$819,000	\$819,000	\$819,000	\$819.000
77	Water Supply Power	\$268	\$35,002	\$57,504	\$77.505	\$95,006	\$96.506	\$103.007	\$97,006	\$100,006		
78	Rinse Recovery Pumping Power	\$298	\$38,891	\$63,893	\$86,117	\$105,562	\$107,229	\$114,452	\$107,785		\$93,506	\$94,500
81	Pullback Pumping Power	\$72	\$36,723	S32,105	S27,486	\$22,867	\$18,249	\$18,249	\$18,249	\$111,118 \$18,249	\$103,896	\$105,007
82	Evaporation Power	\$1,127	\$146,922	\$241,371	\$325,326	\$398.787	\$405,084	\$432,369	\$407,183	\$10,249 \$419,776	\$18,249 \$392,491	\$18,249 \$396,688
83	Hydraulic Control Pumping Power (4 yrs)	\$298	\$14,894	S16,579	\$18,264	\$19,950	\$21,635	\$21,635	\$21,635	\$21,635	\$21,635	-XII-3013
84	Evaporation Power Pullback	\$1,127	\$578,045	\$505,345	\$432,645	\$359.946	\$287,246	\$287,000	\$287,246	\$287,246	·	
85	the following the major of the contract of the		v saara saaraa saaraa ka maraa saaraa ka saaraa k	φοσο,στο,	V102,010	9000,040	9207,240	3207,240	Ψ201,240	\$201,240	\$287,246	\$287,246
86	Rinsing Verification Sampling	\$1,350	\$32,400	\$5,400	\$6,750	\$8,100	\$8,100	\$8,100	\$8,100	\$8,100	\$8,100	\$8,100
87												
88 89	Maintenance: Evaporators, Pumps, Rigs		\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
90	Well Abandonment		-									
91	Wellfield	\$16,448	\$648,660	\$970,660	\$1,249.760	\$1.562,600	\$1,899,920	\$2,156,240	\$2,445,200	\$2,442,200	S2.410.160	S2.468.240
92	HC wells	\$10,300	\$30,900	\$51,500	\$51.500	\$61,800	\$92,700	\$113,300	\$195,700	\$195,700	\$195,700	\$195,700
93	Observation wells	\$41,620	\$83,240	S166.480	S166,480	\$249,720	S249.720	\$332,960	\$582,680	\$582,680	\$582,680	\$582,680
94	POC wells	\$0	\$0	\$0	90	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	50
95	IMW closure	\$10,600	\$328,600	\$307,400	S286.200	\$275,600	\$275,600	\$275.600	\$275,600	\$265,000	\$265,000	\$243,800
96	RW Closure	\$17,000	\$0	\$0	90	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$68,000	\$102,000	\$136,000
97							4-			-	— • 101,000	Ψ100,000
	Post Closure Monitoring (3 POCs, 8 RVW/s,											
98	5 years)	\$30,846	\$154,230	\$154,230	\$154,230	\$154,230	\$154,230	\$154,230	\$154,230	\$154,230	\$154,230	\$154,230
99	0144440											
100	Subtotal of Closure Liability by Year of Shutdown		\$4,903,341	\$5,467,219	\$5,891,271	\$6,419,991	\$6,722,986	\$7,135,047	\$7,697,335	\$7,772,551	\$7,712,574	S7,804,636
101	Contingency for Unanticipated Costs	10%	\$490,334	\$546,722	\$589,127	\$641,999	\$672,299	\$713,505	\$ 76 9,733	\$777,255	\$771,257	\$780,464
102	Closure Liability by Year of Shutdown		\$5,393,675	\$6,013,941	\$6,480,398	\$7,061,990	\$7,395,284	\$7,848,552	\$8,467,068	58,549,806	58,483,832	\$8,585,102
103	Less Rinsing Credits		\$0	50	\$0	\$0	-\$132,489	-\$85,172	-\$164,034	-S123,026	-\$135.644	-S119,871
104	Net Closure Liability by Year of Shutdown		\$5,393,675	\$6,013,941	\$6,480,398	\$7,061,990	\$7,262,795	\$7,763,380	\$8,303,034	58,426,781	58,348,188	\$8,465,231

Attachment R-3 TABLE R3-12 WELL ABANDONMENT COST DETAIL GUNNISON COPPER PROJECT WELL ABANDONMENT COST DETAIL

					WELL HOPETOO	NIVIENT COST DE												
WELLFIELD INJECTION/RECOVERY WELLS		No.	Y2	ýa		Y4		75	Y6			7	Y8			19	Y	10
Injection Wells in Production			I S	23		\$ 38		8 3	l s	32		S 32	T S	34		5 43	T I	\$ 33
Recovery Wells in Production		5 24	\$	35 47		\$ 57		5 56	S	53		\$ 59	5	51		S 51		\$ 54
Injection Wells in Rinsing		7 15	s	- 8		\$ -		5 14	S	23		3	\$	24		5 24	1 1	\$ 24
Recovery Wells in Rinsing		7.745	\$	8		\$		5 13	\$	24	111111111111111111111111111111111111111	\$ 94	\$	36		5 35	1	\$ 30
Dormant Wells		16	\$	- 2000 63		\$ -		5	\$		1000000	6	\$	5		5 5		\$ 11
Total existing Injection/Recovery Wells		38.	\$	58 // 6 // 78	žć.	\$ 95		3 116	\$	132		\$ 150	\$	150		5 148		\$ 152
	Unit cost	Quantity	Quantity	Quantity	Quantity		Quantity		Quantity		Quantity		Quantity	i	Quantity		Quantity	
Mobilization and Demobilization (1)	\$ 10,000.00	lump sum \$ \$ 10,000	1 \$	10,000 1 5 10,000		1 \$ 10,000	1000.1	5 10,000	1 5	10,000	4	\$ 10,000	1 \$	10,000		S 10,000	1 !	\$ 10,000
ADWR Closure Notification	\$ 150.00	each 98 9 5,700	58 \$	8,700 78 5 11,700	95	5 \$ 14,250	116	5 17,400	132 \$	19,800	150	5 22,500	150 \$	22,500	148	5 25,290	152 \$	\$ 22,800
Pump Removal (1)	\$ 1,200.00	each 24 5 28 800	35 \$	42,000 47 5 16,800		7 \$ 68,400	69	\$ 82,800	77 Š	92,400	7.87	S. 104/400	87 \$	104,400	86	\$ 003,700	84 5	\$ 100,800
Injection Well Port Removal (1)	\$ 600.00	each 14 3 3400	23 \$	13,800 21.5 18,600	38	8 \$ 22,800	47	\$ 26,200	55 \$	33,000	63	\$ 27,800	58 \$	34,800	57	\$4,200	57 \$	\$ 34,200
Perforation of Well Casing (2)	\$ 25.00	ft 0 3	0 \$	- 0 5		\$ -	0	6	0 \$			\$,	0 \$	-	0		0 9	\$ -
Abandonment of Boring with Type V Cement (1)(9)(10)	\$ 12.00	ft # 2500 \$1 1247 00	66700 \$	800,400 89700 \$ 1,075,400		\$ 1,311,000	133400			1,821,600	172500	\$ 2,070,000	172500 \$	2,070,000	170200		174800 \$	\$ 2,097,600
Removal of casing 2 feet below grade (1)	\$ 150.00	each and a second	58 \$	8,700 76 \$ 11,700		5 \$ 14,250	7116		132 \$	19,800	150		150 \$	22,500	148		152	\$ 22,800
Disposal of Construction Debris (1) (6)	\$ 25,000.00	lump sum 1 5 25,000	1 \$	25,000 1 5 25,000		1 \$ 25,000	(amort 4		1 5	25,000	7,6774	\$ 25,000	1 \$	25,000	1		1 5	\$ 25,000
Oversight of well abandonments by Consultant (13)	\$ 75.00	hr 300 5 28500	580 \$	43,500 280 5 56,500		\$ 71,250	1160		1320 \$		1500		1500 \$	112,500	1480		1520 \$	\$ 114,000
Project management by Consultant (14)	\$ 125.00	hr 86 5 4,796	58 \$	7,250 78 3 5,850		5 \$ 7,125	116		132 \$		150		150 \$	11,250	148		152	\$ 11,400
Per Diem Consultant (15)	\$ 195.00	each 30 5 7,410	58 \$	11,310 78 \$ 15,210		5 \$ 18,525	216		132 \$		150		150 \$	29,250	148	\$ 28,850	152	
		\$ 648,660	\$	970,660 \$ 1,249,760		\$ 1,562,600	zumatikunt	5 1,899,920	\$	2,156,240		\$ 2,445,200] [5	2,442,200		\$119,160	ئلــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ	\$ 2,468,240
	average cost per		\$	16,736 5 95,029		\$ 16,448		5 16,379		16,335		5 16,301	\$	16,281		5 // 16,285		\$ 16,238
		70	Y2	/Y3		Y4		75	Y6			7	Y8			19	<u>Y</u>	10
HYDRAULIC CONTROL WELLS			5	(A) (A) (A) (A)		5			11		10		19		19		19	
	Unit Cost	Quantity	Quantity	Quantity	Quantity		Quantity		Quantity		Quantity		Quantity		Ouentity		Quantity	
Mobilization and Demobilization (3)	\$ 10,000.00	lump sum	0	0)		5	0				0				0	
ADWR Closure Notification	\$ 150.00	each 3 9 450	5 \$	750 5 5 750	4 -	5 \$ 900	9	S 1.350	11 \$	1,650	19	\$ 2,850	19 \$	2,850	19		19 5	\$ 2,850
Pump Removal (1)	\$ 1,200.00	each 2500	5 S	6,000 5 5 6,000		5 \$ 7,200		5 10,800	11 5	13,200		\$ 22,800	19 \$	22,800	19	\$ 22,800	19 9	\$ 22,800
Perforation of Well Casing (2)	\$ 25.00	n 0 5	0 \$	93	34	o \$ -		8	0 5		0	5	0 \$		0	8	1 0 5	- د
Abandonment of Boring with Type V Cement (9)(11)	\$ 7.00	ft (1 24.550 £ 124.550	5750 \$	40,250 8750 \$ 40,250			10350		12650 S	88,550	21850	\$. 152,950	21850 \$	152,950	21850		21850	\$ 152,950
Removal of casing 2 feet below grade (1)	\$ 150.00	each 3 5 45g	5 \$	750 5 5 750	1 -	\$ 900	9	5 1,390	11 \$	1,650	19	5 2,850	19 \$	2,850	/19	5	19 9	\$ 2,850
Disposal of Construction Debris (1) (6)	\$ 25,000.00	lumpsum	s	- 2		\$	Francisco (Francisco (2	S			3	\$	-		\$	ا ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ	- څ
Oversight of well abandonments by Consultant (13)	\$ 75.00	hr 20 \$ 2,250	50 \$	3,750 50 5 2,750		\$ 4,500	90		110 \$	8,250	190		190 \$	14,250	190		190 \$	
Project management by Consultant (14)	\$ 125.00	hr 3 \$ 975	5 \$	625 5 5 625		5 \$ 750		8 1,125	11 \$		19		19 \$	2,375	19		19 5	\$ 2,375
Per Diem Consultant (15)	\$ 195.00	each 3 5 58%	5 \$	975 8 8 975		5 \$ 1,170		8 1,755	11 S		. 19	\$ 3,705	19 \$	3,705	19		19 3	
		9 30 900	15	51,500 51,500		\$ 61,800		92,700	5			5 195,700	5	195,700		5 195,700	ئلــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ	\$ 195,700
	avg cost per well	\$ 10,300	Ş	10,300 \$ \$0,300	¥.	\$ 10,300		-\$ 10,300	g S	10,300		5, 20,300	\$	10,300		S 10,300	\$	\$ 10,300
					ă									- 8				
		Y4	Y2	Ya .		Y4	19,000000000	YS .	Y6			? (40)	Y8			r9		10
OBSERVATION WELLS		3	4	4		5			8		44		14		12		14	
	Unit cost	Quantity	Quantity	Quantity	Quantity		Quantity		Quantity		Quantity //		Quantity		Quantity		Quantity	
Mobilization and Demobilization (3)	\$ 10,000.00	lump sum 0 8	0 \$	- 70	() \$ -	10	\$ 2	0 5	-	9	S	0 \$	- 1	. 0		0 9	- ۋ
ADWR Closure Notification	\$ 150.00	each 2 \$ 300	4 \$	600 6 5 600		5 \$ 900		\$ 1,200	8 \$	1,200	12	\$ 1,800	12 \$	1,800	12	\$ 1,800	12 \$	\$ 1,800
Pump Removal (7)	\$ 1,200.00	each 6 5	0 \$	- 0 5	8) \$ -	- 6	5	0 5		0	S	0 5		0	5	1 0 5	<u>-</u>
Perforation of Well Casing (1) (8)	\$ 25.00	ft 2000 S 57,500	4600 \$	115,000			6900		9200 \$		18100	\$ 402,500	16100 \$	402,500	18100		16100	\$ 402,500
Abandonment of Boring with Type V Cement (5)(9)(12)	\$ 10.00	Account to the first to the fir	4600 \$	46,000 46,000			16900		9200 \$	92,000	16000	\$ 161,000	16100 \$	161,000	16100		16100	\$ 161,000
Removal of casing 2 feet below grade (1)	\$ 150.00	each 2 5 308	4 5	600 4 5 600	1	5 \$ 900	100	\$, 900	8 5	1,200	14	\$ 2,100	14 \$	2,100	44	\$ 2,100	14 \$	\$ 2,100
Disposal of Construction Debris (1) (6)	\$ 25,000.00	lump sum	5			\$	(mm) (ii) (ii) (ii)	A .	5				5			Au Contract	البيا	3
Oversight of well abandonments by Consultant (13)	\$ 75.00	hr 20 5 1,500	40 \$	3,000 40 6 3,000		\$ 4,500	50		80 \$.140		140 5	10,500 1,750	140		140 \$	
Project management by Consultant (14)	\$ 125.00 \$ 195.00	hr 2 5 250 each 2 5 290	4 \$	500 4 5 500 780 4 5 780		5 \$ 750 5 \$ 1.170	7.69	S 750	8 \$	1,000	19 14			2,730	14		14 5	\$ 1,750 \$ 2,730
Per Diem Consultant (15)	p 195.00					5 \$ 1,170 \$ 249,720			4	332,960	14	\$ 7,790 \$ 502,380	14 \$	582,380	14		14 5	\$ 2,730 \$ 582,380
	Diversion cost	Luciania de la companya de la compan	\$	Name of the second seco		1		J] <u> S</u>	,		3 41 599		41,599		\$ 582,380 \$ 41,599	تا	
	average cost per	w=n 91,920	\$	41,620 41,620	Ĭ.	\$ 41,620		\$ 41,670	ş Ş	41,620		* ****	\$	41,599	24 618	# 284	\$, 41,599
Intermediate Monttonia II-II (1	_					-1								Ë			23	
Intermediate Monitoring wells(19)	Harte Co.	91	29	27	26	1			26		26		25		25			
Makillandar and Damakillandar (N	Unit Cost	Chiarring	Quantity	Quientity	Quantity	1	Outrain Try	12 Table 1000	Quantity		Quariety.		Quantity		Quantity		Quantity	
Mobilization and Demobilization (3)	\$ 10,000.00	lump sum	0	1200	-	1	9	2	9	2.05-			0	3.750	9		1 0	0 2 150
ADWR Closure Notification	\$ 150.00	each 31 3 4,650	29 \$	4,350 27 \$ A,050	26		25		26 \$	3,900		\$ 3,900	25 \$	3,750	25	5 3,750	23 5	\$ 3,450
Pump Removal (1)	5 1,200.00	each 31 \$ 37,200	29 \$	34,800 27 5 82,400		5 \$ 31,200	26	\$ 31,200	26 \$	31,200	db.	5 31,200	25 5	30,000	25	\$ 30,000	23 5	\$ 27,600
Perforation of Well Casing (2)	\$ 25.00 \$ 7.00	n 25650 \$ 249.550	33350 S	233,450 \$1050 \$ 213,860	থ `	7 7	CO O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O	S 209.80	29900 \$	209.300	29900	3 209 300	28750 \$	201,250	28750	\$ 201,250	26450 5	\$ 185,150
Abandonment of Boring with Type V Cement (9)(11)	\$ 7.00	each 32 5 4,650	33350 \$	233,450 \$1050 \$ 212,850 4,350 22 \$ 4,050			29900 26		29900 \$		29900 26	5 3 900	28750 \$	3,750	28730 25		26450 \$	\$ 185,150
Removal of casing 2 feet below grade (1) Disposal of Construction Debris (1) (6)	\$ 25,000.00	each 31 5 9,650 lump sum 5	29 \$	4,250 29 3 3000	4 21	o o o o	20	p 3,900	26 5	3,500		o 1000	25 \$	3,750	43	3.75U	<u> </u>	3,450
Oversight of well abandonments by Consultant (13)	\$ 25,000.00	hr 810 9 23230	290 \$	21,750 270 \$ 20,250	260	\$ 19,500	260	5 19,500	260 \$	19,500	260	5 19,500	250 \$	18.750	250	5 18,750	230 5	\$ 17,250
Project management by Consultant (14)	\$ 125.00	hr 31.5 2.875	290 \$	3,625 27 6 3,375		5 \$ 3,250	260 26		260 \$		260 76	9 3,250	250 \$	3,125	25 25		230 3	\$ 2,875
Per Diem Consultant (15)	\$ 125.00	each 30 \$ 5,045	29 \$	5,655 27 8 5,265		5 \$ 5,070	25 26		26 \$		26	5 5,070	25 \$	4,875	25 25		23 5	
rer piem consultant (13)	> 193,00		29 3	307,980 S 286,740		\$ 276,120	2.00	\$ 276,120			20	5 276.120		265,500			1 43 F	\$ 244,260
	avg cost per well	\$ 325,220 \$ 10,620		10.620 \$ 10.620			E8811111111111111111111111111111111111	\$ 10,620	S		561111111111111111111111111111111111111	\$ 10,620	1 15	10,620			فللسا	\$ 10,620
	avg cost per well	3 10,628	\$	10,020 \$ 10,620	į.	\$ 10,620		10,620	>	10,620		10,620	,	10,620		\$ 10,620	\$, 10,620
Discours of the Control of the Contr						1			-									
Rinse Verification wells Quantity (Recovery wells																	1	
left open until end of LOM) (20)(21)		0	0	4		0	9		0		- 0		4		ģ		8	
Cost per well(20)		5 17,060	s	17,000 \$ 17,000		\$ 17,000		\$ 17,000	Ś	17,000		5 17,500	\$	17,000		5 17,000	1	\$ 17,000
total liability for RVW abandonment		16 2		- 4		s -		I.	s			8	s	64,600.00		5. 102 000 00		\$ 136,000.00
,					3	+			1 1				1	- ,,000.00				200/000.00
	_			- - 	+	+	-	<u> </u>	+ +				 				+	
	1				1	1		1	1				1					

Abandonment Costs by year Summary	i i i	Y2 (¥3	Y4 X5	Y6	Y8 Y9	Y10
Wellfield	\$ 645,660	\$ 970,660 \$ 1.249,760	\$ 1,562,600 \$ 1,899,920	\$ 2,156,240 \$ 2,445,260	\$ 2,442,200 \$ 2,410,160	\$ 2,468,240
HC wells	15 30,900	\$ 51,500 51,500	\$ 61,800 \$ 92,700	\$ 113,300 5 795,760	\$ 195,700 5 195,700	\$ 195,700
Observation wells	\$ 85,240	\$ 166,480 \$ 166,480	\$ 249,720 \$ 250,020	\$ 332,960 \$ 582,480	\$ 582,380 \$	\$ 582,380
iMW Wells	5 309.20	\$ 307,980 \$ 286,740	\$ 276,120 \$ 276,120	\$ 276,120 \$ 276,120	\$ 265,500	\$ 244,260
Rinse Verification Wells/Closure Verification Wells	\$	S - 6	\$ - 2 8	\$ -	\$ 64,600 \$ 202,000	\$ 136,000
		27 28 28 28				
TOTAL ABANDONMENT COST all well types	\$ 1,092,020 \$	\$ 1,496,620 \$ \$ 1,754,480 \$	3 2/150/240 S 3 2/518/260 S	\$ 2,878 km 3 \$ 3,499,400 S	3 3,550,380 \$ 5 9,591,700 \$	\$ 8,626,580

- NOTES:

 (1) from Yellow Jacket Dnilling quote 7/29/16
 (2) injection/recovery and Hydraulic control wells will be open hole construction. Casing will be grouted to minimum of 100 feet above bedrock surface. If a well is screened (with no annula r materials), the screen will be removed prior to grouting. No perforation will be necessary for injection/recovery and hydrau lic control wells.

 (3) Single mobilization cost application cost application cost application on the spirits to all well types. The cost is included in Injection/recovery well bandon ment mob/semble.

 (4) Most HC wells will be open hole construction, and casing will be grouted to minimum of 100 feet above bedrock surface. If a well is screened, the screen will be removed prior to grouting. No perforation will be necessary.

 (5) It is assumed that annular materials have a porosity of 35 % for grout volume calculations.

 (6) Single lump sum for all well as included under the injection/recovery well costs.

 (7) Observation wells are plezometers and will not be equipped with jumps.

 (8) PCC and Observation wells are plezometers and will be installed with screen and annular materials. Perforations (2 per foot) are required under a ADWR's standard abandonment method. Cost assumes average well depth of 1450 feet, average 1150 feet of grout.

 (10) assumes 5 inch open borehole, per Yellow Jacket quote per foot cost of \$12

 (11) assumes 5 inch open borehole, per Yellow Jacket quote per foot cost of \$12

 (12) assumes 4 inch dameter well in 9 finch diameters deep under protection per well, which includes one protection per well, which includes one manular materials protection, per device a protection per well, using Clear Creek Technician trace for this task.

 (4) assumes 110 feet of perforation per well, which includes one manular materials porosity, prorrated cost of \$12 per foot.

 (13) assumes 510 for persion sheet existing (16 MWR) will be included on one manular materials in these wells and the persion of persion will be recovery wells.

 (13) assumes 51